

has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claims 15 and 16. As such, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) with respect to Claims 1-4 and 11-14 is now overcome.

Regarding Claims 5-10 and 15-20, rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Randell* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,913,210, *Call*, this rejection is respectfully traversed as follows with respect to the amended claims.


The Examiner has noted that the *Randall* reference taken by itself fails to teach assembling message packets and transmitting them to an intermediate advertiser server. The Examiner has utilized the *Call* reference to support a rejection for this aspect of the claims. However, it is noted that *Call* is not an analogous reference in that *Call* deals primarily with predetermined barcodes and the such; rather, *Call* is concerned with bar codes that may identify a manufactured product. *Call* does not concern a “sensor” that is associated with a particular function on the doll. It is the storage of associative information within an associative database at the advertiser server for this sensor that allows control of the operation of the doll or the interface therewith. For example, if a given output signal, such as a tone in one of the dependent claims, were output, it is this output signal that is transmitted to the advertiser server. Take the situation where a doll is manufactured with a predetermined set of tones. It may be that the manufacturer actually goes out of business and some other entity takes over the interactive interface with this doll. In this situation, it would only be necessary to recognize at the advertiser server the unique tone or output signal that is received from the doll to determine where the information should be sent or routed, i.e., to the particular manufacturer or vendor or interactive service provider, and then that service provider can utilize the tone or signal to determine what action to take. There is no longer a requirement for a direct connection from the doll to the manufacturer but, rather, it is the unique output signal associated with the sensor that triggers the entire connection and interactive operation. This connection operation, i.e., utilizing the advertiser server to determine routing information such that the doll interface can be routed to the manufacturer, that allows interconnection to the manufacturer or vendor without requiring information to be stored at the doll for these purposes or even at the node associated with the doll. *Call* does not in any way suggest tying a routing function to a sensor but, rather, only concerns itself with the routing function to a barcode, which barcode may be associated with a product. As such, Applicants believe that the combination of



Call and *Randall* fails to disclose the invention as defined by the amended claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection with respect to the remaining of Claims 5-10 and 15-20 and allow the independent Claims 1 and 11.

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/PHLY-24,668 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Gregory M. Howison
Registration No. 30,646

GMH:jk

P.O. Box 741715
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715
Tel: 972-479-0462
Fax: 972-479-0464
January 20, 2003